

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF ACCOUNTABILITY

THE DOCUMENT THAT ENDS THE ARGUMENT

Version 2.0: Clean, Complete, and Counter-Argument Proof

SUBMITTED BY: Shooting Star Advocacy Coalition

DATE: 2026

WRITTEN SO THAT ANY CHILD, WITH ANY LAWYER, CAN WALK INTO ANY COURT IN THE WORLD AND WIN

A NOTE BEFORE WE BEGIN

This document exists because of love.

The fierce kind. The kind that looks directly at hard things and says I see what is happening and I will not pretend it is acceptable and I will not stop until it changes.

Children did not create this broken world. They inherited it. That means the adults who built these systems owe those children something. Not someday. Now.

If the adults refuse to act, the children can sue. The law already allows it. This document is the proof.

We believe in us. Let us begin.

HOW THIS DOCUMENT WORKS

It is written in three layers simultaneously.

LAYER ONE is plain language any child understands.

LAYER TWO is legal argument any lawyer can use in any court.

LAYER THREE is pre-emptive answers to every argument the other side will try.

When you see THEY WILL SAY, that is what they will argue.

When you see WE ANSWER, that is why they lose.

Every answer is grounded in binding law and documented evidence. Not opinion. Not politics. Law and evidence.

A lawyer using this document can sit down, point to the relevant section, and watch the opposition's argument dissolve. That is by design. The children are right. The law agrees. The evidence agrees. All we have to do is show up and show the work.

PART ONE: THE FOUNDATIONAL CLAIM

In One Sentence

Systems of domination built on race, gender, religious authority, and economic power have caused documented, measurable harm to billions of human beings, to non-human animals, and to the Earth's living systems, in direct violation of binding international law, and those responsible owe a remedy to everyone they harmed.

For the Child in the Room

If someone breaks something that belongs to you and keeps breaking it every day, they owe you everything they broke plus everything you could not build because it was broken. That is the whole argument. Everything in this document is proof that the breaking happened, who did it, what it cost, and what the law says has to happen next.

PART TWO: THE PERSONAL SAFETY PRINCIPLE

The Right to Say Get Away From Me

This section exists because harassment is violence and the law has not caught up with that reality. This must change. Here is why, here is the law that supports it, and here is why it matters to everything else in this document.

THE PRINCIPLE

Every human being has the right to physical and psychological safety in their own body and in their own space. When a person clearly communicates that they do not want contact, including with the words get away from me, leave me alone, stop, or no, the other person is legally and morally obligated to stop. Immediately. Without negotiation. Without requiring the person to explain themselves. Without requiring them to be polite about it.

Failure to stop after a clear and explicit instruction to stop is not a minor social violation. It is the foundational act of every form of violence documented in this brief. It is the moment where a person decides that their desire to continue is more important than the other person's right to safety. That decision is the engine of harassment, assault, domestic violence, child abuse, and every other violation of bodily autonomy.

THE LAW ALREADY SAYS THIS

The right to bodily autonomy and personal security is protected under Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 9(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the domestic laws of virtually every nation on Earth.

The right to self-defense when that security is threatened is recognized in the domestic law of virtually every jurisdiction. The specific question this section addresses is why the threshold for recognized self-defense is so high that people are regularly convicted for defending themselves against harassment that did not yet rise to the legal definition of assault.

THE PRACTICAL PROBLEM

A woman is followed. A child is cornered. A man is surrounded. They say stop. Leave me alone. Get away from me. The other person does not stop. Under current law in many jurisdictions, the person being followed, cornered, or surrounded cannot legally defend themselves until the threat becomes physical. They must wait. They must absorb the psychological terror of being refused the right to say no. They must hope the harassment does not escalate before the law will protect them.

This is backwards. It protects the aggressor's freedom to continue over the target's freedom to be safe.

THE PROPOSED LEGAL STANDARD

When a person has clearly communicated that they do not want contact and the other person continues to approach, follow, or engage, the person who communicated the boundary should have the legal right to take reasonable proportionate action to enforce that boundary. This includes moving away, raising their voice, using non-injurious deterrents, and calling for assistance, without legal risk to themselves for those actions.

This is not a new principle. It is the extension of existing self-defense law to the full reality of how harassment and violence actually begin. Violence does not begin when the first punch is thrown. It begins when someone decides that the other person's no does not count.

WHY THIS IS A WHITE SUPREMACY AND PATRIARCHY ISSUE

The legal systems that have consistently failed to protect people from harassment and pre-assault threatening behavior were designed by and for people who did not experience routine harassment as a condition of existing in public. Women, children, LGBTQI+ people, people of color, disabled people, and Indigenous people have all documented rates of public harassment dramatically exceeding those experienced by the men who designed most of these legal systems.

The result is a legal framework calibrated to the experience of people who are rarely the targets of harassment, which systematically fails to protect people who routinely are.

This must change. The legal standard for when you may protect yourself must reflect the actual experience of the people who most need protection.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

No means no. Leave me alone means leave me alone. Get away from me means get away from me. When someone ignores those words and keeps coming, the person who said those words is already in danger. The law should protect them from that moment. Not after the first hit. From the moment their clearly expressed boundary was ignored.

REFERENCES:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 3, Right to Life, Liberty and Security of Person, 1948.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 9(1), 1966.

UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, 1993.

Istanbul Convention, Council of Europe, 2011.

Evan Stark, Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life, Oxford University Press, 2007.

UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Reports on Harassment as Violence, 2018 and 2022.

PART THREE: THE COST OF WHITE SUPREMACY TO ALL OF HUMANITY

The Complete Bill

WHAT IT COST ECONOMICALLY

The transatlantic slave trade forcibly transported 12.5 million African people. The unpaid labor value, with compound interest, is between 14 and 97 trillion dollars according to University of Connecticut calculations.

Colonial extraction from India alone totals 45 trillion dollars between 1765 and 1938. Global south extraction from 1960 to 2018 totals 62 trillion dollars. Africa's total losses over the full colonial period are estimated between 40 and 60 trillion dollars.

Ongoing racial discrimination costs the US economy 800 billion dollars per year. Gender based violence costs 1.5 to 4 trillion dollars globally per year. Disability exclusion costs 1.37 trillion dollars per year. LGBTQI+ discrimination costs hundreds of billions per year globally.

Climate inaction will cost 31 trillion dollars per year by 2050. The cost to prevent it is 4 trillion per year now. The math is not complicated.

TOTAL CONSERVATIVE ANNUAL COST OF THESE SYSTEMS: Between 5 and 10 trillion dollars per year. Every year. That figure would end extreme poverty 20 times over. Every year.

WHAT IT COST WHITE MEN

This section exists because the document must be honest and complete.

White supremacy promised white men the world. What it actually delivered:

Emotional impoverishment. Research documents that men socialized into dominance cultures show higher rates of depression, emotional isolation, and inability to form intimate bonds.

Physical harm. The APA's 2018 Guidelines document that adherence to traditional masculine norms is associated with higher cardiovascular disease, substance abuse, and the highest suicide rate of any demographic group in the United States.

Moral injury. Participating in or benefiting from a system of domination requires the active suppression of empathy. That suppression has a psychological cost paid in anxiety, reduced sense of meaning, and impaired ethical reasoning.

Profound loneliness. Former US Surgeon General Vivek Murthy identifies loneliness as a public health epidemic and data shows men are more affected. A system that teaches domination instead of connection produces men who are profoundly alone.

White supremacy did not protect white men. It used them. The ones at the very top benefited. Everyone else paid the price while being told they were winning.

WHAT IT COST THE EARTH

Since industrial capitalism began, Earth has lost 60 percent of its wildlife. Oceans are acidifying. The Amazon approaches irreversible tipping points. The Arctic warms at four times the global average.

The Earth provides ecosystem services valued at 125 to 145 trillion dollars per year. For free. These services cannot be manufactured. When they are destroyed past tipping points, they are gone. Their value is gone. The species that depended on them are gone.

The communities paying the first and heaviest costs of this destruction are overwhelmingly Indigenous communities, communities of color, and people in the global south who contributed the least to the problem.

This is environmental racism at planetary scale. It violates the right to life, the right to health, and the right to a clean environment under binding international law.

WHAT IT COST HUMAN POTENTIAL

The University of Timbuktu contained 700,000 manuscripts in mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and philosophy at the time of its destruction. Those manuscripts are partially lost. The scholars who would have built on them were enslaved or killed.

Pre-contact populations in the Americas were reduced by approximately 90 percent. Hundreds of distinct civilizations. Hundreds of languages each encoding unique ways of understanding the world. When a language dies, a way of knowing dies with it. It is not archived anywhere. It is simply gone.

Women across every culture were prohibited from accessing education, whose intellectual contributions were suppressed, dismissed, or appropriated for the entirety of recorded history in most cultures. The discoveries that were not made because the most likely people to make them were not permitted to enter the room are invisible losses. They are real.

333 million children currently live in extreme poverty. Each carries the full genetic inheritance of human possibility. Poverty does not eliminate that capacity. It suppresses it. The cost is not only their suffering. It is everything they might have built, discovered, created, and contributed.

The cost of ending extreme child poverty is 150 billion dollars per year. The world spends 2.1 trillion dollars per year on military budgets.

That is a choice. It is documented. It is ongoing. And the children who are its victims can sue over it.

WHAT IT COST FREE WILL

From enslaved people: every choice about every day of their lives. Entirely. For generations.

From colonized peoples: self-governance, cultural integrity, spiritual practice, language, relationship to land.

From women: historically and in many places still, the right to own property, choose a partner, refuse sexual contact, access education, participate in governance, move freely.

From LGBTQI+ people: the right to love who they love, be who they are, exist without fear.

From disabled people: in many cases literally, the right to make decisions about their own lives.

From children in exploitative systems: the right to childhood itself.

The economic concept of the opportunity cost of unfreedom documents that when people cannot make free choices, human capital flows suboptimally, talent goes to waste, and innovation is suppressed. The total cost of lost free will over 500 years is not 10 trillion dollars. It is not 100 trillion dollars. It is the full potential of human civilization minus what human civilization has actually produced under conditions of systematic domination.

The gap between those two numbers is the true cost of white supremacy.

THE ALCHEMY OF ACCUMULATED HARM

Every act of oppression generates costs that exceed the immediate harm. The science of epigenetics, led by Dr. Rachel Yehuda at Mount Sinai, documents that trauma experienced by parents produces measurable biological changes in their children and grandchildren. Holocaust survivors and their children show the same hormonal abnormalities associated with PTSD even in children who personally experienced no trauma. Equivalent research exists for descendants of enslaved people, boarding school survivors, and communities that experienced mass violence.

When you traumatize a person, you do not only harm that person. You alter the biological inheritance of their children.

This means the harm is not historical. It is present. It is cellular. And it is still accumulating.

PART FOUR: THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Rights That Are Already Violated

Every harm documented in Part Three violates one or more of the following binding instruments.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 1979.

Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989.
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2006.
United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007.
Rome Statute, Articles 6, 7, and 8, genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, 1998.
UN Genocide Convention, 1948.
Istanbul Convention on Preventing Violence Against Women, 2011.
UN Resolution 48/13, Right to a Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment, 2021.

These are not suggestions. They are binding law ratified by the majority of the world's nations.

PART FIVE: COUNTER-ARGUMENTS AND WHY THEY FAIL

Every Objection. Every Answer.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT ONE.

THEY WILL SAY: This is history. We cannot be responsible for the past.

WE ANSWER: The wealth extracted was invested and compounded. The harm caused was transmitted biologically and economically. Both are present today. You cannot keep the inherited benefit while disclaiming the inherited liability. The same transaction cannot be history for purposes of debt and present for purposes of asset. Furthermore, the violations are continuing right now. Missing Indigenous women are missing today. Children are in poverty today. The Earth is being destroyed today. History is not the claim. The present is the claim.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT TWO.

THEY WILL SAY: There is no legal mechanism.

WE ANSWER: There are at least seven. The International Court of Justice. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The European Court of Human Rights. The Alien Tort Statute. Domestic class action under Rule 23. Truth and reconciliation commissions. Children's climate litigation. Juliana v. United States established that children have standing. Urgenda in the Netherlands, Future Generations in Colombia, and the German Federal Constitutional Court climate case all succeeded. The doors are open. This document is the map.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT THREE.

THEY WILL SAY: You cannot prove causation.

WE ANSWER: The federal government's own redlining maps explicitly used race as a criterion. The Federal Housing Administration's own 1938 manual explicitly used race. The Indian Removal Act is a primary source document. ExxonMobil's own internal documents prove they knew about climate harm. The Pennsylvania Grand Jury has named names. The causal chain is not theoretical. It is documented in the defendants' own paperwork.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT FOUR.

THEY WILL SAY: Progress has been made.

WE ANSWER: The legal standard is not better than before. It is compliance with binding law. CEDAW requires elimination of discrimination. Not reduction. Elimination. The CRC requires the best interests of children be the primary consideration. Not a consideration. The primary one. When measured against the actual legal standard, the progress argument fails. And in multiple areas including LGBTQI+ criminalization, anti-transgender legislation, and carbon emissions, the data shows regression, not progress.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT FIVE.

THEY WILL SAY: Reparations are too expensive.

WE ANSWER: The economy is already paying between 5 and 10 trillion dollars per year in the ongoing costs of these systems. Reparations are not an additional cost. They are an investment in ending a cost that is already being paid. Germany has paid Holocaust reparations since 1952. The United States paid Japanese American internment reparations in 1988. The City of Evanston implemented municipal reparations in 2021. These programs exist. They function. The argument that they are impossible is contradicted by evidence that they have been done.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT SIX.

THEY WILL SAY: Sovereign immunity protects states.

WE ANSWER: Sovereign immunity has never been absolute. The Nuremberg Tribunals established definitively that sovereignty does not protect against crimes against humanity. Every state that ratified CEDAW, the CRC, the CRPD, the ICCPR, and the ICESCR voluntarily accepted treaty monitoring jurisdiction and waived sovereign immunity claims in those areas. The ICJ currently has cases against multiple states. Sovereignty is not a shield against documented human rights violations.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT SEVEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Religious freedom protects religious institutions.

WE ANSWER: Religious freedom is the right to believe and worship. It is not a license to harm people. The Supreme Court established in *Employment Division v. Smith* that generally applicable laws apply to religious practitioners. Laws against child abuse, fraud, and institutional negligence are generally applicable laws. The Catholic dioceses documented in the Pennsylvania Grand Jury Report did not escape liability on religious freedom grounds. Neither will any other institution that harmed people in the name of belief.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT EIGHT.

THEY WILL SAY: These are political questions, not legal ones.

WE ANSWER: The entire purpose of codifying rights in binding treaties and constitutions is to remove them from pure political determination. Rights that can be voted away by whoever has the most political power at a given moment are not rights. They are privileges. Courts exist to enforce rights against political majorities. A court that declines to enforce justiciable rights on grounds of political controversy is not exercising restraint. It is abandoning its constitutional function.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT NINE.

THEY WILL SAY: The statute of limitations has expired.

WE ANSWER: Three grounds defeat this argument simultaneously. The Convention on Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations establishes no statute of limitations for crimes against humanity and genocide. The continuing violation doctrine holds that when discriminatory effects persist, the violation has not ended and the clock has not started. The fraudulent concealment doctrine tolls the statute when defendants actively hid their wrongdoing, as ExxonMobil, the Catholic Church, and multiple pharmaceutical companies demonstrably did. All three grounds apply simultaneously.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT TEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Nature cannot have legal standing.

WE ANSWER: Corporations have legal standing and they are not living beings. They are legal fictions created last year by a lawyer filing paperwork. If that fiction can sue, a river that has sustained human civilization for thousands of years can have a guardian who speaks for it in court. New Zealand, Ecuador, India, and Colombia have already done this. The Whanganui River has legal personhood. The Amazon has legal standing. The precedents exist. We are asking they be extended.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT ELEVEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Children cannot sue.

WE ANSWER: Children bring legal claims every day through guardians and next friends. The Convention on the Rights of the Child explicitly grants justiciable rights to children. Its Optional Protocol allows children to submit complaints directly to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. Juliana v. United States was filed by plaintiffs as young as eight years old and the Ninth Circuit confirmed they had standing. In Colombia, Germany, and the Netherlands, young plaintiffs have already won. The door is open.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT TWELVE.

THEY WILL SAY: These claims are too vague.

WE ANSWER: Specific institutions. Specific documents. Specific names. The Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative Report names 53 burial sites at identified schools operated by identified federal agencies in partnership with identified religious denominations. The

Pennsylvania Grand Jury Report names specific priests, specific supervisors, specific cover-up communications. ExxonMobil's internal documents from the 1970s naming specific scientists and specific findings are in evidence in ongoing litigation. Nothing about these claims is vague. The defendants would prefer they were.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT THIRTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: International law does not apply in domestic courts.

WE ANSWER: Self-executing treaties are directly enforceable under the Supremacy Clause of the US Constitution. Customary international law is directly enforceable in federal courts under *The Paquete Habana*, 1900. Jus cogens norms including prohibitions on slavery, torture, genocide, and crimes against humanity are enforceable in any court in the world. And where domestic courts are unavailable, international courts have jurisdiction. Every door does not need to open. Only one does.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT FOURTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Other cultures also oppressed people. This is not uniquely a white supremacy issue.

WE ANSWER: The document names harm by every system that caused it. This is not the argument that white supremacy is the only form of oppression. It is the argument that white supremacy is the dominant organizing system of global political and economic power for 500 years and that its costs are the largest documented harm to human civilization in recorded history. Other systems also caused harm and are also documented here. The existence of other wrongdoers does not reduce the liability of this wrongdoer by a single case or a single dollar.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT FIFTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: The free market created these outcomes.

WE ANSWER: The free market does not explain the Indian Removal Act of 1830. It does not explain the Papal Bulls of 1452 explicitly authorizing enslavement by decree. It does not explain federal redlining maps created by government agencies explicitly using race as a criterion. It does not explain laws making it illegal to teach enslaved people to read. These were not market outcomes. They were documented legal choices made by identifiable people in identifiable institutions. Markets operate within legal frameworks. When governments build discriminatory frameworks, the resulting outcomes reflect those legal choices. The law created it. The law can remedy it.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT SIXTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: People should take personal responsibility.

WE ANSWER: Personal responsibility and systemic accountability are not mutually exclusive. We believe completely in personal responsibility. We also believe that when someone passes a law saying you cannot buy a house in this neighborhood, and that law remains in effect for thirty

years, the resulting absence of housing wealth is not a personal responsibility failure. The market did not take those thirty years of wealth. The law did. Personal responsibility exercised under systemic constraints that were deliberately imposed is not the same as personal responsibility exercised from a position of systemic advantage. The law addresses what personal responsibility cannot fix because it was caused by someone else.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT SEVENTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: This is politically motivated.

WE ANSWER: Identify one factual claim in this document that is inaccurate and cite your source. Every claim is sourced from official government investigations, United Nations documentation, peer reviewed academic research, binding international legal instruments, and economic analyses produced by Citigroup, McKinsey, the World Bank, and the IMF. Evidence is not political because it is used in a political context. The autopsy report in a murder case is not political even though it appears in politically charged proceedings. Tell us which number is wrong. We will wait.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT EIGHTEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Nothing can be done about it now.

WE ANSWER: Apartheid was described as impossible to dismantle without catastrophic violence. It was dismantled. Marriage equality in the United States was described as politically impossible until 2015. The Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement in Canada compensated over 79,000 survivors. Germany has paid Holocaust reparations for 70 years. The Dutch Supreme Court ordered a government to reduce carbon emissions. The Colombian Supreme Court granted the Amazon legal standing. Change has happened. Change is happening. The argument that nothing can be done is the last argument of a losing position and it fails on the evidence.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT NINETEEN.

THEY WILL SAY: Personal safety and self-defense claims are too subjective.

WE ANSWER: The standard is objective and simple. Did the person clearly communicate that they wanted the other person to stop and leave? Yes or no. Did the other person stop and leave? Yes or no. If the answer to the first question is yes and the answer to the second question is no, the person who refused to leave after being told to leave has chosen to treat the other person's safety as less important than their own desire to continue. That is the foundational act of harassment. It is documentable, witnessable, and legally actionable. Harassment hotlines, workplace harassment law, stalking statutes, and protective order law all operate on exactly this objective standard. We are asking for its consistent application.

COUNTER-ARGUMENT TWENTY.

THEY WILL SAY: If children win these cases, it will be chaos.

WE ANSWER: The chaos is already here. It is the chaos of 333 million children in poverty. The chaos of a destabilizing climate. The chaos of ongoing Indigenous disappearances without adequate investigation. The chaos of elder abuse in institutions supposed to provide care. The chaos of harassment without adequate protection. What the other side calls chaos is actually accountability. What we are experiencing now is not order. It is the successful suppression of accountability. Courts providing remedy is not chaos. It is the legal system functioning as designed.

PART SIX: THE THEORETICAL SCENARIOS

What They Might Actually Try

SCENARIO ONE. THEY DELAY.

They will file motions. Many motions. The purpose of many motions is to exhaust the patience and resources of the people bringing claims. This is a documented litigation strategy called lawfare when used against legitimate claims.

THE ANSWER: Every day of delay is a day of ongoing documented harm to identified populations. Every motion asking for delay is a motion asking the court to allow ongoing violations to continue while the motion is considered. Courts have the authority to issue interim injunctive relief requiring compliance with legal obligations while litigation continues. File for interim relief. Make them argue in public against the injunction. The argument against interim relief to protect children's futures is not a popular argument to make on the record.

SCENARIO TWO. THEY CLAIM POVERTY.

Institutions and governments may claim they cannot afford remedy.

THE ANSWER: The same institutions and governments claiming poverty maintain lobbyists, legal teams, public relations firms, and often substantial real property holdings. The question of ability to pay is a question for the damages phase, not the liability phase. Establish liability first. Ability to pay is a sentencing question, not a guilt question.

SCENARIO THREE. THEY FRAGMENT THE CASES.

They will argue that each specific harm must be litigated separately in separate courts in separate jurisdictions, making the total task impossible.

THE ANSWER: The systematic and connected nature of these harms is itself the argument for consolidated treatment. Multidistrict litigation procedures, the ICJ's jurisdiction over connected

claims, and the class action mechanism all allow connected harms from connected systems to be litigated together. The fragmentation strategy is a delay strategy. Name it as such.

SCENARIO FOUR. THEY CLAIM THE CHILDREN DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY ARE ASKING FOR.

They will argue that child plaintiffs are being used by adults, do not truly understand the implications of the litigation, and should not be taken seriously as legal actors.

THE ANSWER: The Convention on the Rights of the Child Article 12 guarantees children the right to express views in all matters affecting them with those views given due weight in accordance with their age and maturity. The future children are suing to protect is literally their future. No adult has a more direct stake in it. The argument that children do not understand their own future well enough to sue to protect it is an argument that the people whose future it is should have no voice in what happens to it. Every court that has heard this argument has rejected it. Juliana. Urgenda. Colombia. Germany. The judges understood.

SCENARIO FIVE. THEY ARGUE THAT FEELINGS ARE NOT EVIDENCE.

They will attempt to characterize the emotional and psychological harm documented in this brief as too subjective to be legally cognizable.

THE ANSWER: Psychological harm is legally cognizable in every jurisdiction. Personal injury law compensates for pain and suffering. Intentional infliction of emotional distress is a recognized tort. The PTSD documented in survivors of institutional abuse is diagnosed by licensed clinicians using standardized criteria. The epigenetic changes documented by Rachel Yehuda are measured in laboratories using scientific instruments. The argument that psychological harm is not real harm is not a legal argument. It is a statement about whose suffering counts. Courts have consistently rejected it.

SCENARIO SIX. THEY ARGUE THAT WINNING WOULD SET A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT.

They will argue that if these claims succeed, anyone could sue for anything.

THE ANSWER: The precedent these cases set is not that anyone can sue for anything. It is that documented violations of binding international law by identified responsible parties against identified populations must be remedied. That is not a dangerous precedent. That is the function of law. The precedent that would actually be dangerous is the precedent already being set: that sufficiently powerful institutions can violate the law, harm millions of people, and face no consequences because the scope of the harm makes accountability seem too complicated. That precedent is the one that threatens civilization.

PART SEVEN: THE REMEDY

What We Are Asking For

We are not asking for punishment. We are asking for accountability that produces transformation.

Reparations, structured and evidence-based, for documented economic theft from enslaved people and colonized nations.

Full implementation of UNDRIP by every state party, starting with the United States.

The right to clear personal safety enforcement including the legal right to take proportionate protective action when someone explicitly asks another person to leave and that person refuses.

Structural reform of international financial institutions to end extractive debt structures imposed on formerly colonized nations.

Full enforcement of the Rome Statute against perpetrators of crimes against humanity without exemption based on political power.

Investment in community-controlled, culturally appropriate healing for communities that have experienced intergenerational trauma.

Legal protection for the Earth's living systems through the guardian model already established in New Zealand, Ecuador, Colombia, and India.

Honest education reform including the full history of what has been done and what it has cost.

Full legal protection for all sentient beings based on documented capacity for suffering.

Redistribution of decision-making power to include the people most affected by these systems, which means, most importantly, the children who will live with whatever world we build.

PART EIGHT: FOR THE CHILD IN THE ROOM

Everything You Need to Know

WHAT HAPPENED

Some people decided they were better than other people because of how they looked or who they were. They used that idea to take things. Land. Labor. Children. Languages. Freedoms. Lives. They made laws protecting the taking. They punished anyone who said it was wrong. This went on for a very long time and is still going on in different forms today.

WHY IT WAS WRONG

For the same reason any child knows it is wrong for one child to take another child's lunch. Because it was not theirs. Because the person they took from was hurt. Because having more power than someone does not mean you have the right to hurt them.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW

Because the harm did not stop when the laws changed. The effects of taking something from people last longer than the taking. The science proves this. The economics prove this. The communities living with these effects prove this every single day.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

You can bring a case. Children have done it. They won in the Netherlands. They won in Colombia. They won in Germany. Your lawyer can sit down and let this document do the work. Your job is to say, clearly and simply, this is my future and I want it protected. The law says it should be. This document proves it is not. A court can order that it be.

WHAT HAPPENS IF YOU SAY GET AWAY FROM ME AND SOMEONE DOES NOT LEAVE

You should be protected from that moment. Not after the first hit. From the moment your clearly expressed boundary was ignored. We are working to make that the law. Because the people who designed the current rules were not the people who were most at risk of being harassed. So they did not design rules that adequately protect against harassment. We are changing that. And your voice is part of how it changes.

ABOUT LOVE AND EMPATHY

This entire document is about love. It is about the love that says I see what is happening to you and it is not acceptable. It is about the love that builds something better instead of just being angry about what is broken. Every number in this document represents a person who deserved better. Every legal argument is an attempt to give them, or their children, or their children's children, something closer to what they deserved.

Empathy is not soft. Empathy is what allows you to understand that the person being harassed is fully real, that their fear is fully real, that their future fully matters. The systems documented in this brief succeeded by suppressing empathy. They convinced enough people to stop feeling what was being done to others.

The first act of resistance is to feel it again. To let it be real. To say I see you and what happened to you was wrong and we are going to do something about it.

That is the first step.

You are already on it.

We are all star children.

We are all connected.

The math is on our side.

The law is on our side.

The children are watching.

And we will not stop.

COMPLETE REFERENCE LIST

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 1979.

Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2006.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007.

Rome Statute, 1998.

UN Genocide Convention, 1948.

Istanbul Convention, 2011.

UN Resolution 48/13, Right to a Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment, 2021.

UN General Assembly Resolution 60/147, Basic Principles on Remedy and Reparation, 2005.

Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity, 1968.

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969.

Slave Voyages Database, Emory University.

Thomas Craemer, Estimating Slavery Reparations, Public Administration Review, 2015.

Edward Baptist, The Half Has Never Been Told, 2014.

Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, 1972.

Utsa Patnaik, *Drain of Wealth*, Columbia University Press, 2018.
Jason Hickel et al., *Imperialist Appropriation in the World Economy*, 2022.
Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law*, 2017.
Citigroup, *Closing the Racial Inequality Gaps*, 2020.
McKinsey Global Institute, *The Power of Parity*, 2015.
William Darity and A. Kirsten Mullen, *From Here to Equality*, 2020.

Rachel Yehuda et al., *Holocaust Exposure Induced Intergenerational Effects on FKBP5 Methylation*, *Biological Psychiatry*, 2016.
Resmaa Menakem, *My Grandmother's Hands*, 2017.
Bessel van der Kolk, *The Body Keeps the Score*, 2014.
Bruce Perry and Oprah Winfrey, *What Happened to You?*, 2021.
Maria Yellow Horse Brave Heart, *Historical Trauma Response Among Natives*, 2003.

American Psychological Association, *Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Boys and Men*, 2018.
Vivek Murthy, *Together*, 2020.
bell hooks, *The Will to Change*, 2004.
Evan Stark, *Coercive Control*, 2007.

Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*, 1999.
Martha Nussbaum, *Creating Capabilities*, 2011.
Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 1968.
Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass*, 2013.

Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative Investigative Report, 2022.
Pennsylvania Grand Jury Report, 2018.
Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015.
Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Australia, 2017.
Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety, Australia, 2021.
Pinkerton-Uri Report on Indian Health Service Sterilizations, 1977.

Juliana v. United States, Ninth Circuit, 2020.
Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands, Supreme Court, 2019.
Future Generations v. Colombia, Supreme Court, 2018.
Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, *Climate Protection Act Decision*, 2021.
Baker v. Carr, United States Supreme Court, 1962.
Brown v. Board of Education, United States Supreme Court, 1954.
Bostock v. Clayton County, United States Supreme Court, 2020.
Employment Division v. Smith, United States Supreme Court, 1990.
Obergefell v. Hodges, United States Supreme Court, 2015.
The Paquete Habana, United States Supreme Court, 1900.
New Zealand Te Awa Tupua Act, 2017.
Constitution of Ecuador, *Rights of Nature*, 2008.

WWF, Living Planet Report, 2022.
IPCC, Sixth Assessment Report, 2023.
IEA, Net Zero by 2050, 2021.
Swiss Re Institute, The Economics of Climate Change, 2021.
SIPRI, Military Expenditure Database, 2023.
UNICEF, Child Poverty Report, 2023.
Williams Institute, Economic Cost of LGBTQ Discrimination, 2023.
IMF, Economic Cost of Discriminating Against LGBTQ Plus People, 2022.
World Bank, Statement on Uganda Anti-Homosexuality Act, 2023.
Accenture and AAPD, Getting to Equal: The Disability Inclusion Advantage, 2018.
National Council on Aging, Elder Financial Abuse Statistics, 2024.
AARP, Economic Impact of Elder Abuse, 2023.
UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Report on Harassment, 2022.

Carl Sagan, Pale Blue Dot, 1994.
Christopher Stone, Should Trees Have Standing?, 1972.
Ibram X. Kendi, Stamped from the Beginning, 2016.
Charles Mann, 1491, 2005.
David Stannard, American Holocaust, 1992.
Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States, 2014.

PREPARED BY: Shooting Star Advocacy Coalition

For every child who deserved better.
For every elder who was forgotten.
For every person who said no and was not heard.
For the Earth that sustains all of us.
For the future that is still possible.

We are all star children.
We are all connected.
The first step is already taken.
Let us take the next one together.